

# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

m

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/516,699	03/01/2000	Hiroshi Koike	Hitachi-0006	3585
21302	7590 04/03/2006	EXAMINER		
,	OSHIDA & DUNLEA	CAMPBELL, JOSHUA D		
EIGHT PENN SUITE 1350,	N CENTER 1628 JOHN F KENNEDY	ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
PHILADELPHIA, PA 19103			2178	

DATE MAILED: 04/03/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

		Applicat	ion No.	Applicant(s)					
		09/516,6	899	KOIKE ET AL.	KOIKE ET AL.				
Office Action Summary		Examine	er	Art Unit					
		4	). Campbell	2178					
Period fo	The MAILING DATE of this communication or Reply	n appears on th	e cover sheet with t	the correspondence ad	dress				
THE   - Exte after - If the - If NC - Failu - Any	ORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR R MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION insions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 C SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, or period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory pure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by reply received by the Office later than three months after the end patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	ON. FR 1.136(a). In no elon. , a reply within the staperiod will apply and vistatute, cause the ap	vent, however, may a reply atutory minimum of thirty (30 will expire SIX (6) MONTHS plication to become ABANI	be timely filed  3) days will be considered timely 6 from the mailing date of this co	y. ommunication.				
1)⊠	Responsive to communication(s) filed on	<u>26 July 2004</u> .							
		This action is n	ion-final.						
3)□	_								
Dispositi	on of Claims								
5)□ 6)⊠ 7)□	Claim(s) 1-40 is/are pending in the application.  4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrawn from consideration.  Claim(s) is/are allowed.  Claim(s) 1-40 is/are rejected.  Claim(s) is/are objected to.  Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.								
<i>,</i> —	on Papers	411d/01 0100t(011 t	requirement.						
9) 10)	The specification is objected to by the Exa The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) Applicant may not request that any objection to Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the co	accepted or by the drawing(s) or the drawing(s) orrection is requi	be held in abeyance. red if the drawing(s) i	See 37 CFR 1.85(a). s objected to. See 37 CF					
	inder 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120	TO EXAMINOT: IV	oto the attached of	mice Action of form 1	0-132.				
12) \( \tag{ } \) \( \t	Acknowledgment is made of a claim for fo All b) Some * c) None of:  1. Certified copies of the priority docur 2. Certified copies of the priority docur 3. Copies of the certified copies of the application from the International Bucknowledgment is made of a claim for donne a specific reference was included in the CFR 1.78.  The translation of the foreign language acknowledgment is made of a claim for donne certain for donne	ments have been ments have been priority documureau (PCT Rualist of the cert mestic priority une first sentence provisional apprestic priority unestic priority unestication unestication under the priority unestication under the priority unestication under the priority unestication under the priority under t	en received. en received in Appl ents have been rec le 17.2(a)). ified copies not rec inder 35 U.S.C. § 1 e of the specificatio pplication has been inder 35 U.S.C. §§	ication No ceived in this National actional action 19(e) (to a provisional n or in an Application 1900) received. 120 and/or 121 since action 1900	application) Data Sheet. a specific				
Attachment									
2) 🔲 Notice	e of References Cited (PTO-892) e of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948 nation Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No			nary (PTO-413) Paper No(s nal Patent Application (PTO					

### **DETAILED ACTION**

1. This action is responsive to communications: Request for continued examination filed 7/26/2004 and amended drawings filed 10/18/2004.

2. Claims 1-40 are pending in the case. Claims 1, 12, 23, and 32 are independent claims. Claims 1, 10-12, 23, 24, 32, and 33 have been amended.

#### Oath/Declaration

The Oath/Declaration does not identify the citizenship of each inventor. The application is missing the citizenship of the fifth inventor.

## Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

- 3. The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior Office action.
- 4. Claims 1-4, 6-8, 10, 12-15, 17-19, 21, 23-28, 31-37, and 40 remain rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Baxter et al. (US Patent Number 6,356,903, filed on December 30, 1998) in view of Danneels (US Patent Number 6,038,598, filed on February 23, 1998).

Regarding independent claim 1, Baxter et al. discloses a method of using a template to generate and update web pages based on specified trigger events (call with argument) that occur before a client requests a page (column 7, lines 16-21, and column 9, lines 28-33 of Baxter et al.). The web page is then stored as two parts, an outline and a template (including trigger events). These parts are then combined when

a client requests the page (column 1, 46-50 of Baxter et al.). Baxter et al. does not disclose storing the page as one part in a table or storing an additional page based on an update trigger call.

However, Danneels discloses a method in which multiple completed dynamic pages are stored in a database (table) that are mapped to a single URL (filename), while the pages are mapped to a single URL, they are actually addressed at separate unique URLs. The condition depicting their generation and what would cause them to be accessed is contained within the database and associated with each version of the page in the URL (column 1, line 14-column 3, line 35 of Danneels). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have combined the method of Baxter et al. for generating pages with the method of Danneels for storing and organizing the use of pages because it would have allowed for pages to be preloaded that satisfy different conditions that are transparently mapped to a single URL (i.e. different times of day).

Regarding dependent claim 2, Baxter et al. discloses a method of generating a web page using a template in which executable content (i.e. CGI script) is handled via execution and a result is returned upon completion of execution in the form of HTML code (character string) (column 5, line 37-column 6, line 11 of Baxter et al.).

Regarding dependent claims 3 and 4, Baxter et al. discloses a method of handling the executable code within a dynamically generated web page using triggers and an application services procedure (column 5, lines 64-67-column 6, lines 1-2 of Baxter et al.). Immediate executable code will be run when a page is generated. The

use of triggers would cause delayed executable code to be converted and executed upon the occurrence of a trigger event.

Regarding dependent claim 6, Baxter et al. discloses a method of using triggers to cause a page update that may be defined as driven by a date, time, change in data, or other events (column 15, lines 10-25 of Baxter et al.).

Regarding dependent claim 7, Baxter et al. does not disclose the use of an "update flag" in response to data update events. However, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art that the use of a flag is a programming method that adds nothing to functionality of the triggers already disclosed by Baxter et al. One of ordinary skill in the art would have used an update flag in the method disclosed by Baxter et al. It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art because the use of flags is just one of many ways to operate triggers.

Regarding dependent claim 8, Baxter et al. disclose a method in which the web page will continually update based on the set triggers regardless of when the page is requested by a client (column 12, lines 23-27 of Baxter et al.).

Regarding dependent claim 10, Baxter et al. discloses a method in which the pages are generated, updated, and stored on a server (column 5, lines 1-3 of Baxter et al.).

Regarding independent claim 12 and dependent claims 13-15, 17-19, and 21, these claims contain substantially similar subject matter as claims 1-4, 6-8, and 10. In addition to this, Baxter et al. teaches a method of page generation to be applied in

the embodiment of a system (column 4, lines 10-12 of Baxter et al.). Thus, the claims are rejected along the same rationale as claims 1-4, 6-8, and 10.

Regarding independent claim 23, Baxter et al. discloses a method of using a template to generate and update web pages based on specified trigger events (call with argument) that occur before a client requests a page (column 7, lines 16-21, and column 9, lines 28-33 of Baxter et al.). The web page is then stored as two parts, an outline and a template (including trigger events). These parts are then combined when a client requests the page (column 1, 46-50 of Baxter et al.). Baxter et al. does not disclose storing the page as one part in a table or storing an additional page based on an update trigger call.

However, Danneels discloses a method in which multiple completed dynamic pages are stored in a database (table) that are mapped to a single URL (filename), while the pages are mapped to a single URL, they are actually addressed at separate unique URLs. It is determined whether a page is a part of a set (an existing URL) or a new page (new URL) The condition depicting their generation and what would cause them to be accessed is contained within the database and associated with each version of the page in the URL (column 1, line 14-column 3, line 35 of Danneels). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have combined the method of Baxter et al. for generating pages with the method of Danneels for storing and organizing the use of pages because it would have allowed for pages to be preloaded that satisfy different conditions that are transparently mapped to a single URL (i.e. different times of day).

Regarding dependent claim 25, Baxter et al. discloses a method of using a template to generate and update web pages based on specified trigger events, which determine if there is need for an update before a client requests a page (column 7, lines 16-21, and column 9, lines 28-33 of Baxter et al.).

Regarding dependent claims 26 and 27, Baxter et al. discloses a method of handling the executable code within a dynamically generated web page using triggers and an application services procedure (column 5, lines 64-67-column 6, lines 1-2 of Baxter et al.). Immediate executable code will be run when a page is generated. The use of triggers would cause delayed executable code to be converted and executed upon the occurrence of a trigger event.

Regarding dependent claim 28, Baxter et al. discloses a method of using triggers to cause a page update that may be defined as driven by a date, time, change in data, or other events (column 15, lines 10-25 of Baxter et al.).

Regarding dependent claim 31, Baxter et al. discloses a method in which the pages are generated, updated, and stored on a server (column 5, lines 1-3 of Baxter et al.).

Regarding independent claim 32 and dependent claims 33-37 and 40, the claims incorporate substantially similar subject matter as claims 23-28 and 31. Thus, the claims are rejected along the same rationale as claims 23-28 and 31.

5. Claims 5 and 16 remain rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Baxter et al. (US Patent Number 6,356,903, filed on December 30, 1998) in view of

Danneels (US Patent Number 6,038,598, filed on February 23, 1998) as applied to claim 4 above, and further in view of Slade (US Patent Number 6,269,275, filed on March 31, 1998).

Regarding dependent claim 5, Baxter et al. does not disclose a method of incorporating user information into the generated page. However, Slade discloses a method in which customized presentations are updated periodically (column 3, lines 6-10 of Slade). During the operation of this method user profile information is gathered by a computer for use in the customization in the generation of presentations (column 4, lines 41-45 of Slade).

One of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made would have used the method of Slade to incorporate user information in the customization in the method of Baxter. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to do this because it would have allowed for further personalization of the dynamically generated pages.

Regarding dependent claim 16, this claim contains substantially similar subject matter as claim 5. In addition to this, Baxter et al. teaches a method of page generation to be applied in the embodiment of a system (column 4, lines 10-12 of Baxter et al.).

Thus, the claim is rejected along the same rationale as claim 5.

6. Claims 9, 20, 29, and 38 remain rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Baxter et al. (US Patent Number 6,356,903, filed on December 30, 1998) in view of Danneels (US Patent Number 6,038,598, filed on February 23, 1998)

as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of the Microsoft Press Computer Dictionary (published by Microsoft Press in 1997).

Regarding dependent claim 9, Baxter et al. does not disclose a method of storing the generated web page on a proxy server. However, the Microsoft Press Computer Dictionary contains this definition of a proxy server: A proxy server can improve performance by supplying frequently requested data, such as a popular web page... (page 387 of Microsoft Press Computer Dictionary).

One of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made would have used a proxy server to store the web page generated in the method of Baxter et al. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art because it was common practice in the art to use proxy servers to provide access to web pages.

Regarding dependent claim 20, this claim contains substantially similar subject matter as claim 9. In addition to this, Baxter et al. teaches a method of page generation to be applied in the embodiment of a system (column 4, lines 10-12 of Baxter et al.).

Thus, the claim is rejected along the same rationale as claim 9.

Regarding dependent claim 29, Baxter et al. does not disclose a method of storing the generated web page on a proxy server. However, the Microsoft Press Computer Dictionary contains this definition of a proxy server: A proxy server can improve performance by supplying frequently requested data, such as a popular web page... (page 387 of Microsoft Press Computer Dictionary).

One of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made would have used a proxy server to store the web page generated in the method of Baxter et al. It

would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art because it was common practice in the art to use proxy servers to provide access to web pages.

Regarding dependent claim 38, the claim incorporates substantially similar subject matter as claim 29. Thus, the claim is rejected along the same rationale as claim 29.

7. Claims 11, 22, 30, and 39 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Baxter et al. (US Patent Number 6,356,903, filed on December 30, 1998) as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Nguyen (US Patent Application Publication Number 2002/0147788, filed on September 13, 1996).

Regarding dependent claim 11, Baxter et al. does not disclose the use of his method on a client site. However, Nguyen discloses a method of preloading web pages in which the client site makes requests to a server based on a page it already has loaded (page 2, paragraph 30, lines 7-12 of Nguyen).

One of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made would have operated the method of Baxter et al. on the client site as taught by Nguyen. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art because it would have allowed the method to be operated in a larger variety of locations.

Regarding dependent claim 22, this claim contains substantially similar subject matter as claim 11. In addition to this, Baxter et al. teaches a method of page generation to be applied in the embodiment of a system (column 4, lines 10-12 of Baxter et al.). Thus, the claim is rejected along the same rationale as claim 11.

Regarding dependent claim 30, Baxter et al. does not disclose the use of his method on a client site. However, Nguyen discloses a method of preloading web pages in which the client site makes requests to a server based on a page it already has loaded (page 2, paragraph 30, lines 7-12 of Nguyen).

One of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made would have operated the method of Baxter et al. on the client site as taught by Nguyen. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art because it would have allowed the method to be operated in a larger variety of locations.

Regarding dependent claim 39, the claim incorporates substantially similar subject matter as claim 30. Thus, the claim is rejected along the same rationale as claim 30.

### Response to Arguments

8. Applicant's arguments filed 7/26/2004 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Regarding arguments on pages 14-19, regarding the amended limitations of the independent claims dealing with unique filenames/URLs, the examiner contends that the rejection as presented in this action teaches the limitations of the claims. Applicant argues that the Danneels reference does not disclose this reference because the web page sets of Danneels are all mapped to a single URL. While this is correct, it does not teach away from the claims. Mapping is not the same as storing, the web page sets of Danneels are all stored as unique URLs, however in order to make the invention of Danneels functionally transparent to the user, which is believed to be an advantage

rather than a disadvantage. The multiple unique URLs are mapped to a single URL so that the user may access the correct dynamic page by simply going to the single mapped URL which then provides access to whichever unique URL is correct given the current situation and the dynamic web page arguments and page generation calls(column 1, line 14-column 3, line 35 of Danneels). The unique URLs contain the arguments within the URL itself, for instance "d1" and "d2" contained in the examples shown at the bottom of Column 2, in Danneels show that the web page sets at these URLs were designed based on the arguments/constraints referenced by "d1" and "d2", thus are separate pages that may be presented to the user based on the current conditions.

Regarding arguments on pages 15-16, regarding how web page data is stored as taught by Baxter, the examiner contends that the rejection of the limitations dealing with this idea remain proper. Applicant argues that the web page data in Baxter is stored as separate components. The examiner agrees with the applicant on this point, however that does not change the fact that in Baxter the page is generated and stored to be presented to the user upon request, regardless of how the page is physically stored it still exists as a previously generated web page (column 7, lines 16-21, and column 9, lines 28-33 of Baxter et al.), at least as currently defined by the applicant's claimed invention. In addition to this, it is important to note that web pages in general are stored as a set of components, for instance in the applicants figures (Figures 15 and 16) the result web page shown contains an image, but when the HTML code is viewed for such a web page the web page will merely contain a link to said image which is stored as a

separate component. There is not evidence in the applicant's specification to the contrary, at which point it would lead the examiner to believe that a finished web page is stored as a set of components.

#### Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Joshua D. Campbell whose telephone number is (571) 272-4133. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F (7:30 AM - 4:00 PM).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Stephen Hong can be reached on (571) 272-4124. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

STEPHENTHONG
SERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER

JDC March 21, 2006